

## REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 18-26 and 27-41 are pending. Non-method claims were previously cancelled. New claims 27-41 are non-method claims.

Claims 18-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fish et al. (U.S. 7,185,317) in view of Cheeniyil et al. (U.S. 6,990,664) in view of Challenger et al (U.S. 6,256,712). Applicants respectfully traverse, however, to expedite prosecution, Applicants have amended certain claims.

During a telephone conference, Examiner Nguyen indicated that amending the independent claims based on Applicants' Figure 5 would expedite prosecution. Therefore, Applicants have amended claims 18 and 26 based on Applicants' Figure 5 and Specification, paragraph 51, which states:

Fig. 5 is a flowchart illustrating an exemplary dependent update workflow process 500 that may be employed by the web content management system of Fig. 1 A. In a block 502, some or all of a web site is re-rendered. Re-rendered portions of a web site include, in one embodiment, pages that depend on an updated component that has triggered a dependent update workflow process. In a block 504, the site is sent to a % staging server 504a. The staging server 504a is a temporary deployment target at which the site can be tested prior to public deployment. In a block 506, the site may be tested under a load. This testing may be performed using, for example, testing suite applications for subjecting the site to repeated use. Alternatively or in combination, the site may be tested by a number of human testers, such as, for example, beta testers. In a block 508, the site may be sent to a categorization and search server. The categorization and search server may recategorize the content of the site, build a new index for the site, and facilitate, based on the foregoing, searches of the site. In a block 510, the site may be deployed to a production server 510a. In light of the foregoing, a skilled artisan will appreciate that dependent update workflow processes may be used to ensure that a proper procedure is followed during an update of a web page that depends on previously updated components. *By using dependent update workflow processes to ensure adherence to such procedure, a developer 126 may avoid web site development errors, such as, for example,*

*a failure to re-render a web page that includes an updated component.* In addition to the foregoing operations, a skilled artisan will appreciate, in light of this disclosure, other operations that may be included in a dependent update workflow process, such as, for example, previously listed operations. [Emphasis added.]

Amended claims 18 and 26 describe, for example, executing a dependent update workflow process to: re-render at least some part of the web site; test the web site under a load; recategorize content of the web site; build a new index for the web site; and deploy the web site to a production server.

Applicants respectfully submit that the cited references, either alone or in combination, do not teach or suggest the subject matter of amended claims 18 and 16. Applicants respectfully submit that dependent claims 19-25 are also not taught or suggested by the cited reference, either alone or in combination, at least by their dependence on amended claim 18.

Applicants respectfully submit that new claims 27-41 are not taught or suggested by the cited references.

### Conclusion

For all the above reasons, Applicants submit that the pending claims are patentable. Should any additional fees be required beyond those paid, please charge Deposit Account No. 09-0460.

The attorney of record invites the Examiner to contact her at (310) 553-7973 if the Examiner believes such contact would advance the prosecution of the case.

Dated: March 18, 2009

By: \_\_\_/Janaki K. Davda/\_\_\_\_\_

Janaki K. Davda  
Registration No. 40,684

Please direct all correspondences to:

Janaki K. Davda  
Konrad Raynes & Victor, LLP  
315 South Beverly Drive, Ste. 210  
Beverly Hills, CA 90212  
Tel: (310) 553-7973  
Fax: 310-556-7984